



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/590,375	06/09/2000	Keiji Endo	2173-0120P	2206

7590 02/25/2004  
Birch Stewart Kolasch & Birch LLP  
P O Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

SLOBODYANSKY, ELIZABETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1652

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/590,375

Applicant(s)

ENDO ET AL.

Examiner

Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD

Art Unit

1652

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: the scope of the claims has been changed requiring further consideration and search.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 25-27.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,5,6,10 and 12-24.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 7-9.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*E. Slobodyansky*  
Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1652

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the rejections are maintained for the reasons of record in view of non-entry of the amendment. In particular, Applicants argue that "the Examiner asserts that the specification does not support a final mutant sequence having 95% homology to SEQ ID NO:1. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner on this point. In Reply filed on July 25, 2003, Applicants pointed out several examples of final mutant  $\alpha$ -amylase sequences having at least 95% homology to SEQ ID NO:1 (see the table on page 13 of the Reply)" (Remarks, page 15). This is not persuasive because while Applicant pointed out several of final mutant  $\alpha$ -amylase sequences each of which having at least 95% homology to SEQ ID NO:1, the claims are drawn not to said specific final mutants but to a genus of mutants having 95% homology to SEQ ID NO:1. Support for the specific species that are not claimed does not translate to the support for the claimed genus. The property of being 95% homologous to SEQ ID NO:1, said property common to all species within a genus is not supported by the specification.